

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/021,698	KEITH ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Daniel M Sullivan	1636

**All Participants:**

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(1) Daniel M Sullivan.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Paula Wittmayer.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 17 December 2003

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant  Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:  Yes  No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See *Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

*Anne-Marie Falk*

**ANNE-MARIE FALK, PH.D**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The parties discussed the nonresponsive letter mailed on 17 December 2003. The Examiner indicated that the original response to the restriction requirement was in fact complete with the election of SEQ ID NO: 19. Therefore, no response to the 17 December communication is required..